I1.100

First Input _____
Second Input _____

CALFED CATEGORY III PROPOSAL
INITIAL REVIEW - RFP #1 (v4, 7/31/97)
July/Aug 1997

Proposal # ~~F1-238~~ Applicant USDA

Intended for Prop 99 Submittal

Initial Review Recommendation:

Pass Initial Review? Yes No

If no, reject based on: _____

FORMATTING REQUIREMENTS See only executive summary attached

APPLICANT

1. Applicant/Organization

2. Applicant Type (Identify lead applicant, include one of types 1-6)
   1. California State Agencies (include in-state universities)
   ✓ (2.) Federal Agencies
   3. Non-profit Organizations
   4. Other Private Entities
   5. Other Public Agencies (includes out-of-state universities)
      a. Educational Institution
      b. Resource Conservation District
      c. Irrigation/Water District
      d. Reclamation District
      e. City
      f. County
      g. Other
   6. Joint Venture (this only applies if applicant includes more than one of the 1-5 categories.

3. Name of Applicant

4. Address

5. City

6. State

7. Zip Code

8. Phone

9. Fax

10. Email

DESCRIPTION

1. RFP Group Type
   1. Public Works/Construction
   2. Land Acquisition
   3. Other Services

2. County Tuolumne

3. Requested Amount (in thousands) 5000

4. Cost Share Amt (in thousands)

5. Cost Share Partners
   a. CVPIA
   b. Four Pumps
   c. Tracy Fish Agreement
   d. Applicant

6. Duration of Category III Funding 0.5 1.0 1.5 2.0 2.5 3.0 years

TECHNICAL REVIEW

Reviewed by dg

Is project in ERPP Study Area? No
Note: If project is not in ERPP Study Area, project does not pass initial review, no further review needed. Indicate reasons for rejection on first page.

PROJECT TYPE - for definitions refer to pgs 6-7 of RFP (circle all that apply, mark a P next to the Primary category) **If proposal clearly breaks out dollars by category and each amount in over $1 million, fill out additional sheets for each category with dollar amount indicated.**

1. Watershed Management Planning & Implementation
2. Construction
3. Land Acquisition
4. Aquatic and Terrestrial Habitat Restoration
5. Water Quality
6. Monitoring, Assessment and Reporting (site specific or large scale)
7. Research
8. Education
9. Operations and Maintenance

WATERSHED (MUST select one or more of types 1-22, may also include one or more of subcategories) **If proposal clearly breaks out dollars by region and each amount is over $1 million, fill out additional sheets for each region with dollar amount indicated.**

1. Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta
    a. North Delta
    b. East Delta
    c. South Delta
    d. Central and West Delta
2. Suisun Marsh/North San Francisco Bay
    a. Suisun Bay and Marsh
    b. Napa River
    c. Sonoma Creek
    d. Petaluma River
    e. San Pablo Bay
3. Sacramento River
    a. Keswick Dam to Red Bluff Diversion Dam
    b. Red bluff Diversion Dam to Chico Landing
    c. Chico Landing to Colusa
    d. Colusa to Verona
    e. Verona to Sacramento
4. North Sacramento Valley
    a. Clear Creek

I-007864

b. Cow Creek
c. Bear Creek
d. Battle Creek

5. Cottonwood Creek
    a. Upper Cottonwood Creek
    b. Lower Cottonwood Creek
6. Butte Basin
    a. Paynes Creek
    b. Antelope Creek
    c. Mill Creek
    d. Deer Creek
    e. Big Chico Creek
    f. Butte Creek
    g. Butte Sink
7. Colusa Basin
    a. Stony Creek
    b. Elder Creek
    c. Thomes Creek
    d. Colusa Basin
8. Feather River/Sutter Basin
    a. Feather River
    b. Yuba River
    c. Bear River and Honcut Creek
9. American River
10. Yolo Basin
    a. Cache Creek
    b. Putah Creek
    c. Solano
11. Eastside Delta Tributaries
    a. Cosumnes River
    b. Mokelumne River
    c. Calaveras River
12. San Joaquin River
    a. Vernalis to Merced
    b. Merced to Mendota Pool
    c. Mendota Pool to Gravelly Ford
    d. Gravelly Ford to Friant
13. East San Joaquin Basin
    a. Stanislaus River
    b. Tuolumne River
    c. Merced River
14. West San Joaquin Basin
15. North Sacramento River Watershed

16. East Sacramento River Watershed
17. West Sacramento River Watershed
18. San Joaquin River Watershed
19. South and Central San Francisco Bay
20. Fresno Sough/Mendota Sub Region
21. Ocean
22. Not Applicable

HABITAT - for definitions refer to pgs 20-23 of RFP (circle all that apply)

1 Tidal perennial aquatic habitat (freshwater)
2 Seasonal wetland and aquatic
3 Instream aquatic
4 Shaded riverine aquatic
5 Saline emergent wetlands (tidal)
6 Midchannel islands and shoals
7 North Delta agricultural wetlands and perennial grasslands
✓ (8) Not applicable

SPECIES - for definitions refer to pgs 23-24 of RFP (circle all that apply)

1 San Joaquin river and east-side tributary fall-run chinook salmon
2 Late-fall run chinook salmon
3 Winter-run chinook salmon
4 Spring-run chinook salmon
5 Delta smelt
6 Longfin smelt
7 Splittail
8 Steelhead trout
9 Green sturgeon
10 Striped bass
11 Migratory birds
✓ (12) Not applicable

STRESSOR CATEGORY - for additional definitions of each stressor category see the Attachment C in the RFP, pgs 25-33

1. Hydrograph Alterations - includes changes in flows such as quantity, timing velocity and depth of flow--water acquisitions proposal are not eligible
2. Entrainment - includes direct mortality of fisheries due to unscreened diversions, diversions not screened to current standards, inoperable screens and impingement
3. Migration barriers and straying
4. Floodplain and marshplain changes - includes physical or hydrological isolation of floodplain, elimination of fine sediment replenishment, land use changes in floodplain/marshplain

5. Alteration of channel form or meander - includes channel aggradation due to increase in fine sediments, channel form changes, prevention of meander, loss or reduction of riparian zone, isolation of side channels and tributaries
6. Reduction of gravel recruitment
7. Water quality - includes increase contaminants, salinity, and nutrient or carbon input
8. Water temperature
9. Invasive plants
10. Invasive organisms
11. Adverse fish and wildlife harvest impacts
12. Artificial propagation of fish
13. Land use changes - includes grazing, gravel mining, urbanization, forestry and agricultural practices
14. Wildfire
15. Human disturbance - includes disturbance of fish and wildlife populations by anglers, boaters and other recreational users

E1.100

F1-238

Executive Summary

Granite Watershed Restoration Pilot Project

Applicant:

U.S. Department of Agriculture
Forest Service
Pacific Southwest Region

Stanislaus National Forest
19777 Greenly Road
Sonora CA 95370

Co-Applicant:

County of Tuolumne

Cooperating Partner:

Regional Council of
Rural Counties

Projection Description and Primary Biological/Ecological Objectives

This project is a pilot demonstration of watershed protection and restoration projects within and adjacent to the Granite Burn on the Stanislaus National Forest. The Granite Burn occurred in August, 1973, and consumed 17,000 acres in the eastern portion of the forest near Yosemite National Park.

The project area is a concentrated site amenable to a variety of restoration projects such as timber stand thinning, riparian and meadow revegetation and road maintenance and obliteration. This project will provide immediate watershed protection benefits and will serve as a learning model of how to coordinate and gain efficiency in multi-resource restoration of forested watersheds.

The Granite project area has also been selected also because restoration and maintenance has been deferred due to funding limitations. There is currently a large backlog of needed restoration in this area. Timber plantations are at extreme risk from wildfire.

The project is a portion of the Tuolumne River watershed. We envision conducting a watershed analysis on this watershed in the near future. The Granite project will be a helpful tool in adaptive management within the framework of the Tuolumne River watershed.

The project is a collaborative effort between the Stanislaus National Forest, Tuolumne County, the Regional Council of Rural Counties and private enterprises and other groups.

Primary Biological/Ecological Objectives

1) To conduct restoration to protect the project area from the immediate threat of large and damaging wildfire, to restore hydrologic function to meadows and riparian areas, and to reduce stream sedimentation.

2) To serve as a restoration model coordinating and implementing future multi-resource restoration efforts.

Approach/Tasks/Schedule

We plan to design, coordinate and implement the following tasks over a 3-5 year period:

a) Thinning to reduce risk of stand replacing wildfire. This will be accomplished by 6500 acres of ponderosa pine plantation thinning and 1000 acres of second growth mixed conifer thinning. This work can start in 1998 and would be accomplished within a 3 year timeframe.

b) Road closures and maintenance to reduce stream sedimentation. This will be accomplished by closing unneeded roads and performing maintenance elsewhere. This work can start in 1998 and would be accomplished within a 3-5 year timeframe.

c) Brush removal in riparian areas followed by establishing riparian species to enhance shading and increase plant diversity. This work can start in 1998 and would be accomplished within a 3 to 5 year timeframe.

d) Restore hydrologic function in meadows to increase water holding capacity and reduce sedimentation. This work can start in 1998 and would be accomplished within a 3 to 5 year timeframe.

Justification for the Project and CALFED Funding

This project will provide immediate protection to an area under threat of large and damaging wildfire and will develop a model for multi-resource restoration.

This project is a component of the CALFED Bay-Delta program strategy supported by RCRC. It is a keystone to fire hazard reduction and improvement of watershed values. This watershed supplies drinking water to City and County of San Francisco, portions of Tuolumne County, and other portions of the greater Bay Area. This watershed is also a significant recreation use area.

Budget Costs and Third Party Impacts

Total project costs over five years are estimated to be $5,000,000: $2,000,000 for 1998 project design and partial implementation; $2,000,000 in 1999 for project implementation; $1,000,000 in 2000 for implementation; and $100,000 per year from 1998-2007 for monitoring and evaluation.

Third party impacts will accrue as benefits to the local economy from the employment and monetary recirculation generated by this project.

Applicant Qualifications

The Forest Service is well experienced as a land steward. Together with private contractors this project can be professionally implemented.

Monitoring

Implementation and effectiveness monitoring would be conducted on all aspects of this project, including water quality, quantity and timing.

Local Support/Compatibility with CALFED Objectives

This project has full support of Tuolumne County and the Regional Council of Rural Counties. We have already engaged in collaborative efforts with these entities to develop a strategy to implement this project.